toms. Its effect on the revenues received from customs would be negligible. Some experts have estimated the loss of revenue at not more than $10,000 a year. Whatever the exact figure, surely it would be outweighed by the value—not monetary, but esthetic—of such a desirable stimulus to the growth of American culture.

Mr. Speaker, this is legislation which certainly ought to be given high priority. Not only would its passage greatly aid the progress of many of our great museums and educational institutions, but it would effectively accelerate the free exchange of art ideas and cultural thought, from which our Nation as a whole stands greatly to benefit.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this legislation will receive the wide support of a great many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia Day. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN] is recognized.

GEORGE MASON MEMORIAL BRIDGE

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 5534) to designate the bridge to be constructed over the Potomac River near 14th Street in the District of Columbia, under the Act of July 16, 1946, as the George Mason Memorial Bridge, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the same be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does this cost any money?

Mr. McMILLAN. It does not. It only names the bridge.

Mr. GROSS. It does not provide for the construction of another bridge across the Potomac River at the expense of all the taxpayers?

Mr. McMILLAN. No, sir. That was provided for in 1956. This just names the bridge.

Mr. GROSS. Does this bill provide for some kind of a celebation once the bridge is completed.

Mr. McMILLAN. I do not know anything about a celebration. It will be 2 or 3 years before the bridge is built.

Mr. GROSS. It is contemplated, according to the last paragraph of the bill, to hold suitable ceremonies in connection with naming of the bridge and I want to make sure that will not cost the taxpayers any money.

Mr. McMILLAN. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman will state definitely that it will not cost any money when they get around to celebrate completion of the bridge?

Mr. McMILLAN. Perhaps the gentleman from Virginia can answer the gentleman.

Mr. BROYHILL. It is provided for following the completion of the bridge. It is rather confusing what we mean by "the 14th Street Bridge," because there are two of them. Last year we named the incoming northbound 14th Street Bridge as the Rochambeau Bridge and they had appropriate unveiling ceremonies designating it as such. This bill provides for the naming of the old 14th Street Bridge as the George Mason Bridge, and it is provided for an unveiling celebration. I will not say it will not cost any money, but I do not think the cost of such a ceremony is an undesirable cost.

Mr. GROSS. With that response I would like to put the House on notice now that it may expect a bill later on. The bridge ought to have a name, but I see no reason why all the taxpayers of the country should provide the money to hold a celebration to open this bridge.

Congress does not provide money for the opening of a toll bridge across the Mississippi River that is built by private enterprise and paid for by those who use it; the Federal Government does not spend money, nor should it, for any such ceremonies in the Midwest, and I know of no reason why the taxpayers of Iowa should be called upon to pay for any ceremony in connection with this bridge or any other bridge across the Potomac.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection, but I want to serve notice here and now that if I am a Member of Congress when this bridge is completed I will oppose the appropriation of a single dime of taxpayer money for the bridge-naming celebration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the bridge to be constructed over the Potomac River from a point near Fourteenth Street in the District of Columbia to a point in Virginia, under authority of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges to replace the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes", approved July 16, 1946 (60 Stat. 566), shall be known and designated as the "George Mason Memorial Bridge". Any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States in which such bridge is referred to shall be held to refer to such bridge as the "George Mason Memorial Bridge".

SEC. 2. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall—

(1) place on the George Mason Memorial Bridge a name plaque of suitable and appropriate design; and

(2) in connection with the opening of such bridge to the public, provide for suitable ceremonies honoring George Mason, the American statesman of the Revolutionary War period from the State of Virginia, who drafted the renowned Virginia Declaration of Rights which became the basis for the first ten amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, section 1 of the bill provides that the bridge which will replace the existing 14th Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River shall be known and designated as the "George Mason Memorial Bridge."

Section 2 provides that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall, first, place on such bridge a name plaque of suitable and appropriate design; and second, in connection with the opening of such bridge to the public, to provide suitable ceremonies honoring George Mason, the American statesman of the Revolutionary War period from the State of Virginia, who drafted the Virginia Declaration of Rights which became the basis for the first 10 amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia I call up the bill (H.R. 1844) to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia approved June 19, 1934, as amended by the acts of July 2, 1940, and July 12, 1950, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 10(1) of chapter V of the Life Insurance Act, as amended (sec. 35–710(1), D.C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended (1) by striking out "twenty-five employees" in subsection (c) thereof, and inserting in lieu thereof "ten employees", and (2) by striking out the period at the end of subsection (d) thereof and adding the following: "unless 150 per centum of the annual compensation of a covered employee exceeds $20,000, in which event all such insurance shall not exceed $40,000, or 150 per centum of such annual compensation, whichever is less."

SEC. 2. Section 10(3) of chapter V of the Life Insurance Act, as amended (sec. 35–710(3), D.C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended (1) by striking out the words "twenty-five members" in subsection (c) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "ten members", and (2) by deleting "issued to the union" in the second sentence of subsection (d), and (3) by striking out the period at the end of subsection (d) thereof and adding the following: "unless 150 per centum of the annual compensation of a covered union member exceeds $20,000, in which event all such insurance shall not exceed $40,000, or 150 per centum of such annual compensation, whichever is less."

SEC. 3. Section 10(4) of chapter V of the Life Insurance Act, as amended (sec. 35–710 (4), D.C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended by striking out the period at the end of sub-

section (d) thereof and adding the following: "unless 150 per centum of the annual compensation of a covered person exceeds $20,000, in which event all such insurance shall not exceed $40,000, or 150 per centum of such annual compensation, whichever is less."

SEC. 4. Section 10(5) of chapter V of the Life Insurance Act, as amended (sec. 35–710(5), D.C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended by striking out "fifty employees" and inserting in lieu thereof, "ten employees."

SEC. 5. Section 10 (generally) of chapter V of the Life Insurance Act, as amended (sec. 35–710, D.C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended by adding the following two new subsections, subsections 6 and 7:

"(6) A policy issued to an association which has been organized and is maintained for purposes other than that of obtaining insurance, which shall be deemed the policyholder, to insure members, or employees of members, of such association for the benefit of persons other than the association, or any of its officials, representatives, or agents, subject to the following requirements:

"(a) The members or employees eligible for insurance under the policy shall be all the members, and all the employees of the members, of the associations, or all of any class or classes thereof determined by conditions pertaining to their employment, or to membership in the association, or both.

"(b) The premium for the policy shall be paid by the policyholder either wholly from the association's funds, or partly from such funds and partly from funds contributed by the insured members or employees specifically for their insurance, or from funds wholly contributed by the insured members or employees specifically for their insurance. A policy on which any part or all of the premium is to be derived from funds contributed by the insured members or employees specifically for their insurance may be placed in force only if at least 60 per centum of the then eligible members or employees or a minimum of four hundred members, whichever is less, excluding any as to whom evidence of individual insurability is not satisfactory to the insured, elect to make the required contributions. A policy on which no part of the premium is to be derived from funds contributed by the insured members specifically for their insurance must insure all eligible members or employees, or all except any as to whom evidence of individual insurability is not satisfactory to the insurer.

"(c) The policy must cover at least twenty-five members or employees at date of issuance.

"(d) The amounts of insurance under the policy must be based on some plan precluding individual selection either by the members or employees, or by the association. No policy may be issued which provides term insurance on any association member or employee which, together with any other term insurance under any group life insurance policy or policies, exceeds $20,000, unless 150 per centum of the annual compensation of such person exceeds $20,000, in which event all such term insurance shall not exceed $40,000, or 150 per centum of such annual compensation, whichever is less.

"(7) Any policy issued pursuant to this section, except a policy issued to a creditor pursuant to subsection (2) hereof, may be extended to insure the spouses and minor children of insured persons, or any class or classes thereof, subject to the following requirements:

"(a) The premiums for the insurance shall be paid by the policyholder either from the policyholder's funds or from funds contributed by the insured person, or from both. If any part of the premium is to be derived from funds contributed by the insured persons, the insurance with respect to spouses and children may be placed in force only if at least 75 per centum of the then eligible employees or association members, excluding any as to whose family members evidence of insurability is not satisfactory to the insurer, elect to make the required contribution. If no part of the premium is to be derived from funds contributed by the insured persons, all such eligible employees or association members, excluding any as to whose family members evidence of insurability is not satisfactory to the insurer, must be insured with respect to their spouses and children.

"(b) The amounts of insurance under the policy must be based upon some plan precluding individual selection either by the insured persons or by the policyholder, and shall not exceed with respect to any spouse or child, 50 per centum of the insurance on the life of such insured person.

"(c) Upon termination of the insurance with respect to the spouse of any insured person by reason of such person's termination of employment or membership or death, the spouse insured pursuant to this section shall have the same conversion rights as to the insurance on his or her life as is provided for the insured person under section 35–711.

"(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 35–711, only one certificate need be issued for delivery to an insured person if a statement concerning any dependent's coverage is included in such certificate."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 4, line 6, after the word "members" insert the phrase "or employees".

On page 4, line 9, strike the word "insured" and insert the word "insurer".

On page 4, line 11, after the word "members" insert the phrase "or employees".

On page 6, lines 9 and 10, strike "35–711" and insert in lieu thereof "11".

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the District of Columbia Life Insurance Act presently authorizes, first, the issuance to an employer or to the trustee of a fund established by an employer of a group life insurance policy covering a group of at least 25 employees; second, the issuance to a labor union of a group life insurance policy covering at least 25 union members; third, the issuance to the trustees of a fund established by two or more employers in the same industry or by one or more labor unions, or by one or more employers and one or more labor unions of a group life insurance policy covering at least 100 persons and not less than an average of five persons per employer unit; and fourth, the issuance to certain designated Government officials of group life insurance policies covering at least 50 Government employees. In the cases of the first three classes of persons described above, the amount of insurance coverage per person may not exceed $20,000. Existing law does not now authorize an association which has been organized and is maintained for purposes other than that of obtaining insurance to be issued a group life insurance policy nor does existing law provide for the inclusion in any such policy of spouses and minor children of insured persons.

H.R. 1844 amends the act to authorize the issuance to an employer or trustee of a fund established by an employer, to labor unions, to trustees for one or more labor unions, two or more employers, or one or more employers and one or more labor unions, and to certain designated Government officials, group life insurance policies covering a minimum of ten persons. The bill also increases the limitation of insurance coverage from $20,000 to $40,000. Further, associations which have been organized and are maintained for purposes other than obtaining insurance are made eiligible to be issued policies of group life insurance. The coverage of such policies may, under the bill, be extended to include the spouses and minor children of the insured persons.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this time would not be taken, but a letter was received this morning, enclosing a newspaper clipping that reads:

CONGRESSIONAL PAY ISN'T CHICKEN FEED

(By Inez Robb)

In the current congressional Easter recess, Members of the Senate and House are back home, so I read, trying to get a whiff of the political climate and taking the pulse of the electorate.

So far, my Congressman, much less my Senator, has not been around to lay ary finger on my pulse. But if either shows up, he'll find my pulse jumping like a yo-yo. And I'll be real happy to tell him why.

It isn't so much the present widespread revelations of nepotism (or me-and-my family firstism) that has my pulse leaping like a trout stream—there are chiselers in every profession—as what it all adds up to.

And what it adds up to is that American Congressmen are among the most highly paid and most lightly taxed executives in the country.

Frankly, I feel like a nitwit that for years I have swallowed the surface fact that Senators and Members of the House receive a flat salary of $22,500 annually.

The truth is that Congressmen receive from three to eight times that sum, for they belong to that most-privileged and lordly of all modern financial categories, the expense-account aristocracy.

Including all their extraordinary perquisites, which they have voted themselves over the years, the congressional take-home pay, the great majority of it tax exempt, ranges anywhere from $70,000 to more than $180,000 annually.

The Congress has been shrewd enough to vote itself a flat salary of $22,500 and to take the rest of its big, fat cut in the form of expenses, which are tax exempt.

The Congress has made it as difficult as possible for the public to assay the swag connected with membership in the club.

By law, the Members of the House are limited to $37,000 annually for secretarial help. The House recently put on the pressure to up that sum by another $14,500 for another administrative assistant.

And remember, fellow voter, all this lovely expense account money is tax exempt. And you really ain't heard nothing yet. Of course, you have read about the $1,200 annual allowance received by each Congressman for an office in his home town. Ah, those glassed-in front porches.

In Washington, each Congressman occupies a luxurious suite, in either the Senate or House Office Buildings, suites sometimes as large as seven rooms. Of course, the furniture and equipment of these offices are on

Uncle Sam, too. (Remember the story recently about the number of congressional typewriters that have disappeared?)

The commercial rent on such splendid offices (and how vulgar of me to turn commercial) in a city as crowded as Washington, D.C., would be very costly, indeed, if a Congressman were forced to pay his way.

Then $3,000 of the $22,500 of acknowledged salary is tax exempt because of the "hardship" being forced to maintain a residence in Washington, D.C.

Note this paragraph:

And what it adds up to is that American Congressmen are among the most highly paid and most lightly taxed executives in the country.

Now, it seems to me that statement would be of interest to all of us. I am sure it will be of interest to people who are thinking of running for office.

Here is another quote:

Frankly, I feel like a nitwit. That for years I have swallowed the surface fact that Senators and Members of the House receive a flat salary of $22,500 annually.

Now, what this young lady—and I think she is young and beautiful—put in the press is amazing—if she has been around here for some time and is a young lady of discernment. That she did not know until recently what Congressmen are getting is most amazing, to me, especially from the Detroit Free Press. I know of the Detroit Free Press. The father of the editor, John Knight—and he has, I understand, three great papers—was once a Congressman from the Akron, Ohio, district, and, presumably, John S. himself is at least slightly interested in Congressmen, their qualifications—incidentally, their compensation. I know the Detroit Free Press has good people—a most excellent reporter in Jim Haswell. He is on the ball all the time. He gets the news when it is news, and very accurately. I have never noticed any venom in his reports. But this girl—I assume she is a girl—just does not know what we are getting for the duties we are presumed to do.

Listen to this. She wrote:

The truth is that Congressmen receive from three to eight times that sum, for they belong to that most-privileged and lordly of all modern financial categories, the expense-account aristocracy.

Including all their extraordinary perquisites, which they have voted themselves over the years, the congressional take-home pay, the great majority of it tax exempt, ranges anywhere from $70,000 to $180,000 annually.

Now, if any of you have been in any doubt about what your take-home pay is, check up on this statement of Inez.

Where in the world does the dear lady get that kind of misinformation? If in doubt, she should have checked. Can anyone estimate the misunderstanding, the envy, that statements of that kind cause among the people of our districts? Perhaps some have known exactly what a Congressman receives. When they read this statement in the Detroit Free Press that some of us get $70,000, some $180,000, they see it "black on white" and, with the other misleading statements they read, straightaway conclude that the Congressman who tells them, when asked, the true amount of their compensation, are liars.

While Inez may be young, she may also be old enough to remember that there was a day when the people, reading a newspaper, were of the opinion that the statements therein were true.

Now, I had a lame back for quite some time. My colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] has been here so long and he was limping around a little while ago. Maybe he and I had bad backs, that is, from carrying that money home, all of that $180,000. If they paid us in Lincoln pennies, it sure was some load. I do not know where Inez has been—upstairs, or down eating. She sure did not get the facts right. I hope that the Detroit Free Press management will call her attention to the necessity of being approximately accurate because some folks read that paper and certainly Mr. Knight does not want his readers deceived. If his news stories are untrue no one will believe his editorials.

She states further:

The Congress has been shrewd enough to vote itself a flat salary of $22,500 and to take the rest of its big, fat cut in the form of expenses, which are tax exempt.

She should know better. Why mislead on that item? But just why does she charge us with getting tax-exempt sums when the record shows otherwise. If I said she weighed 50 pounds more than she does, would she be mad?

She states:

The Congress has made it as difficult as possible for the public to assay the swag connected with membership of the club.

May I ask my friend from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], What is the meaning of "swag"? What does that mean as Inez uses it?

Swag means "booty, boodle, plunder, also spoils," and, of course, Inez knows the meaning of the term. Sure, the Congressmen have their failings, as do a few other people. But after all, this is the people's Congress and one of the good things about the people is that even the sassiest, dirty-faced little brat is, by his mother, thought to be quite a child.

May I plead with Inez, in my behalf if in behalf of no one else. We are bad enough. Do not make us any worse than we are.

She also wrote:

By law, the Members of the House are limited to $37,000 annually for secretarial help. The House recently put on the pressure to up that sum by another $14,500 for another administrative assistant.

If I ever get one, I am going to lend him to Inez so that she may get the facts, write a true report. She needs information not imagination. A paper that continues to print fancy rather than facts soon loses the confidence of its readers.

She goes on to say:

And remember, fellow voter, all this lovely expense account money is tax exempt.

Of course, you have read about the $1,200 annual allowance received by each Congressman for an office in his home town.

Ah, those glassed-in front porches.

Bless your heart, dear Inez, you would be one of the first to kick if the Congressman did not ask you to be seated when you called in his hometown—just what and the sum total of expense items would you allow, Inez?

Neither you nor the Detroit Free Press nor the other papers pays any gallery rent, but Inez, you have been sitting up there in the comfortable press gallery and on those nice, soft cushions while waiting for a timid Congressman to leave the floor at your finger-crooking to answer your call in the hope you would send on a good word to your paper. So why do you let out an unladylike squawk?

Instead of worrying and complaining about the furniture used in the Capitol which the Congressmen are permitted to use, Inez might give a little thought to the fact that she is treated in the same way when in the Capitol. If she does not watch her step, she will get sore just sitting around waiting for something to happen. The services she gets are all tax free.

Surely she wants to leave us enough so that, when we come on the floor or down in the well, we will not be arrested for not being properly dressed.

She states further on:

In Washington, each Congressman occupies a luxurious suite, in either the Senate or House Office Buildings, suites sometimes as large as seven rooms.

You boys with seven rooms, let us know where they are. She says "seven rooms." Go over to my office and find out. I have tried to wriggle the Speaker out of a nice place up in front, but he keeps me in a back corner. I am glad he does because there are three windows on one side of my office. Of course, there are a couple of girls in there, but I do not mind that, although it is a little embarrassing sometimes when folks from back home come in, like the six or seven who came in this morning. But, we all get along and some way the work gets done. I wish, however, you distinguished Members of the House who have seven rooms would let us know where they are and how any of us can get them.

Of course, the furniture and equipment of these offices are on Uncle Sam, too.

She sits up there and pounds a Government typewriter, she and the rest of the reporters; lolls back in a comfortable chair, has a cigarette tray handy if she wants one, a glass of cool, clear water waiting in the hand of a Congressman if she wants it. I wish some of these boys and girls who are so critical of Congressmen would get a looking-glass—I will help pay for it—and take a look at themselves every morning before coming to work and see how much better they are than the rest of us—then be just a little charitable.

Ah, yes, furniture. Inez even complains about the furniture. I bought two surplus desks for the office one day and I would bet, if I was a betting man, when I go home pretty quick and take them along, someone will accuse me of stealing them.

Typewriters. Inez wrote:

Remember the story recently about the number of congressional typewriters that have disappeared?

Is a Congressman to blame if any are gone or once in a while a reporter lets one stick to his fingers? I do not think so. I have not the slightest idea that it happened. Inez writes:

The commercial rent on such splendid offices (and how vulgar of me to turn commercial) in a city as crowded as Washington, D.C., would be very costly, indeed, if a Congressman were forced to pay his way.

Do they want us to rent space here? And, Inez, I have a home in Allegan, Mich. Wife and I built it 59 years ago—house and lot, $1,200—rent one here for $110 a month. Inez, if I was getting $180,000 a year, tax free, I might think of paying $120 a month.

Writes Inez:

Then $3,000 of the $22,500 of acknowledged salary is tax exempt.

Poor dear. She does not know all she is writing about.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ATTACHMENT AND GARNISHMENT OF WAGES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 836) to amend the code of law for the District of Columbia by modifying the provisions relating to the attachment and garnishment of wages, salaries, and commissions of judgment debtors, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia", approved March 3, 1901, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 1104 thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 1104A. ATTACHMENT OF WAGES.—(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, where an attachment is levied upon wages due a judgment debtor from an employer-garnishee, such attachment shall become a lien and a continuing levy upon the gross wages due or to become due to the judgment debtor for the amount specified in the attachment to the extent of (1) 10 per centum of so much of the gross wages as does not exceed $200 due or to become due to the judgment debtor from the employer-garnishee for the pay period or periods ending in any calendar month, plus (2) 20 per centum of so much of the gross wages as exceeds $200 but does not exceed $500 due or to become due to the judgment debtor from the employer-garnishee for the pay period or periods ending in any calendar month, plus (3) 50 per centum of so much of the gross wages as exceeds $500 due or to become due to the judgment debtor from the employer-garnishee for the pay period or periods ending in any calendar month. Such levy shall be a continuing levy until the judgment, interest, and costs thereof are fully satisfied and paid, and in no event shall moneys be withheld, by the employer-garnishee from the judgment debtor, in amounts greater than those prescribed by this section. Only one attachment upon the wages of a judgment debtor shall be satisfied at one time. Where more than one attachment is issued upon the wages of the same judgment debtor and served upon the same employer-garnishee, the attachment first delivered to the marshall shall have priority, and all subsequent attachments shall be satisfied in the order of priority set forth in section 452 of this Act.

"(b) It shall be the duty and responsibility of any employer upon whom an attachment is served, and who at such time is indebted for wages to an employee who is the judgment debtor named in such attachment, or who becomes so indebted to such judgment debtor in the future and while such attachment remains a lien upon such indebtedness, to withhold and pay to the judgment creditor, or his legal representative, within fifteen days after the close of the last pay period of the judgment debtor ending in each calendar month, that percentage of the gross wages payable to the judgment debtor for the pay period or periods ending in such calendar month to which the judgment creditor is entitled under the terms of this section until such attachment is wholly satisfied: *Provided,* That upon written notice of any court proceeding attacking such attachment or the judgment on which it is based, the employer shall make no further payments to the judgment creditor or his legal representative until receipt of an order of court terminating such proceedings. Any payments made by an employer-garnishee in conformity with this subsection shall be a discharge of the liability of the employer to the judgment debtor to the extent of such payment. Under this subsection the employer-garnishee shall not withhold or pay over more than 10 per centum of the gross wages payable to the judgment debtor for any pay period ending in any calendar month until the total amount of gross wages paid or payable to the judgment debtor for all pay periods ending in such calendar month equals $200, nor more than 20 per centum of the gross wages in excess of $200 payable to the judgment debtor for any pay period ending in any calendar month until the total amount of gross wages paid or payable to the judgment debtor for all pay periods ending in such calendar month equals $500.

"(c) It shall be the duty and responsibility of the judgment creditor (1) to file with the clerk of the court, every three months after the serving of an attachment, a receipt showing the amount received and the balance due under the attachment as of the date of filing, and (2) to file a final receipt with the court, furnish a copy thereof to the employer-garnishee, and to obtain a vacation of the attachment within twenty days after the attachment has been satisfied. If the judgment creditor fails to file any of the receipts prescribed in this subsection, any interested party may move the court to compel the defaulting judgment creditor to appear in court and make an accounting forthwith. The court may, in its discretion, enter judgment for any damages, including a reasonable attorney's fee, suffered by, and tax costs in favor of, the party filing the motion to compel the accounting.

"(d) If the employer-garnishee willfully fails to pay to the judgment creditor the percentages prescribed in this section of the wages which become payable to the judgment debtor for any pay period, judgment shall be entered against him for the whole amount of the judgment creditor's judgment, interest, and costs and execution shall be had thereon except that in no event shall judgment be entered against the employer-garnishee in an amount greater than the gross wages which became payable to the judgment debtor for the pay period or periods with respect to which the employer-garnishee willfully failed to pay to the judgment creditor the percentages prescribed in this section. If the employer-garnishee fails—but not willfully, to pay to the judgment creditor the percentages prescribed in this section of the wages which become payable to the judgment debtor for any pay period, judgment shall be entered against him for an amount equal to the percentages with respect to which such failure occurs.

"(e) If a judgment debtor resigns or is dismissed from his employment while an attachment upon his wages is wholly or partly unsatisfied, such attachment shall lapse and no further deduction shall be made thereon unless the judgment debtor is reinstated or reemployed within ninety days after such resignation or dismissal.

"(f) For purposes of this section, the term 'wages' means—

"(1) wages, salary, commissions, or other remuneration for services performed by an employee for his employer, including any such remuneration measured partly or wholly by percentages or share of profits, or by other sums based upon work done or results produced, whether or not the employee is given a drawing account, and

"(2) any drawing account made available to an employee by his employer.

The term wages shall not include any amount paid or payable to an employee who is not a resident of the District of Columbia as remuneration for services performed within the District of Columbia, if the period for which the employee is engaged by the employer to perform such services within the District of Columbia is less than fifteen consecutive days' duration; and any such amount shall be subject to attachment without regard to this section.

"(g) The per centum limitations prescribed by subsection (a) of this section shall not apply in the case of execution upon a judgment, order, or decree of any court of the District of Columbia for the payment of any sum for the support of maintenance of a person's wife, or former wife, or children, and any such execution, judgment, order, or decree shall, in the discretion of the court, have priority over any other execution which is subject to the provisions of this section.

"(h) No attachment issued by the municipal court for the District of Columbia upon a judgment of such court duly docketed in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and levied within 6 years from the date of such judgment upon the wages due or to become due to the judgment debtor from the employer-garnishee, shall lapse or become invalid prior to complete satisfaction solely by reason of the expiration of the period of limitation set forth in section 4(c) of the Act of April 1, 1942 (56 Stat. 193; D.C. Code 11–755).

"(i) Where the judgment debtor claims or is proved to be rendering services to or employed by a relative or other person or by a corporation owned or controlled by a relative or other person, without salary or compensation, or at a salary or compensation so inadequate as to satisfy the court that such salary or compensation is merely colorable and designed to defraud or impede the creditors of such debtor, the court may direct such debtor to make payments on account of the judgment, in installments, based upon a reasonable value of the service rendered by such judgment debtor under his said employment or upon said debtor's then earning ability.

"(j) Where an attachment levied under section 1104A is based upon a judgment obtained by default or consent without a trial upon the merits, the court, upon motion of any interested person, may quash such attachment upon satisfactory proof that such